

REMARKS

In the Office Action, dated June 14, 2007, the Examiner states that Claims 1-12 are pending, and Claims 1-12 are rejected. Additionally, the specification is objected to. By the present Amendment, Applicant amends the specification and the claims.

In the Official Action, the title of invention is objected to for not being descriptive and failing to be indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed. The Applicant has amended the title of invention to "A Decorative Multilayer Material Impregnated With Resin" as suggested by the Examiner.

In the Official Action, Claims 1-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The Applicant has amended independent Claim 1 to specify that the base material layer comprises the impregnated paper layer. The Applicant would like to indicate that the impregnated paper layer is comprised in each of the surface layer and the base material layer. As explained in the specification of the present application, the decorative material is produced by making each of the surface layer and the base material layer to have a similar impregnated paper layer. (line 22, page 15 to line 15, page 18). The method of production prevents the uncured thermosetting resin from passing through the surface resin layer and thereby allows the present invention to achieve an advantageous effect of restraining the deterioration in design appearance. The present invention also has the advantageous effect of the decorative sheet having both excellent surface endurance and internal endurance. (line 22-26, page 12).

The Applicant has amended Claim 2 to specify that the blocking layer is the impregnated blocking layer. Claim 4 has been amended to specify that the blocking layer is the independent blocking layer and to correct the lack of antecedent basis. Claim 6 has been amended to clarify that the blocking layer comprises the independent blocking layer and the impregnated blocking layer. The wording "including" in Claims 9 and 12 has been removed and the term "comprising" has been added. The above-mentioned amendments to Claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 9, and 12 should overcome the current indefinite rejections to those claims and any claims dependent thereon.

In the Office Action, Claims 1-8 and 10 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-3 of Takemoto (U.S. 6,514,624) in view of Takeuchi et al. (U.S. 6,558,799), and over claims 1-10 of Takeuchi et al. in view of Takemoto.

As has been made clear by the amendment to Claim 1, the surface layer and the base material layer has the impregnated paper layer. In contrast, neither of the cited references teaches or suggests the same. Therefore, the present invention is distinguishable from both Takemoto and Takeuchi et al. and the present invention is not obvious to either reference.

In the Office Action, Claims 1-8, and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Takemoto. Claims 1-8 and 10 are also rejected as being anticipated by Takeuchi et al. As mentioned above, Claim 1 of the present application claims that the surface layer and the base material layer both have the impregnated paper layer. This feature is not disclosed in either of the cited references and therefore, the present invention is not anticipated by either Takemoto or Takeuchi et al.

In the Office Action, Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Arai et al. (U.S. 4,196,033). Claims 8-9 and 11-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Arai et al., over Takemoto, and Takeuchi et al. in view of Rosenkranz et al. (U.S. 4,339,566). The Applicant respectfully disagrees with and transverses the rejections based on Arai et al. Independent Claim 1 of the present application claims a blocking layer to block an ooze out of the uncured material of the thermosetting resin. In other words, the blocking layer is to prevent contact between the surface resin layer and the uncured thermosetting resin. In contrast, Arai et al. does not disclose a blocking layer. Arai et al. discloses a process for producing a decorative sheet by contacting and adhering the planar shaping member or the film to the still uncured thermosetting resin, and subsequently peeling off the film to remove the still uncured thermosetting resin adhered to the film. Therefore, if a blocking layer were added to Arai et al., the blocking layer would block the contact between the uncured thermosetting resin and the film, which would hinder the effects of the invention disclosed in Arai et al.

Moreover, independent Claim 1 of the present application claims the use of an ionizing radiation curing resin. In contrast, Arai et al. discloses irradiating the

thermosetting resin with ultraviolet rays to fully cure the resin; however, it is completely silent regarding using an ionizing radiation curing resin.

Therefore, because Arai et al. does not teach or suggest that which is claimed in the present application, the present invention is not obvious to Arai et al, and the Applicant respectfully requests the obviousness rejections with respect to Arai et al. be withdrawn.

In light of the foregoing response, all the outstanding objections and rejections are considered overcome. Applicant respectfully submits that this application should now be in condition for allowance and respectfully requests favorable consideration.

Respectfully submitted,



November 12, 2007

Date

Attorney for Applicant
Brian W. Hameder
c/o Ladas & Parry LLP
224 South Michigan Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60604
(312) 427-1300
Reg. No. 45613